

### **REMARKS**

Claims 2 – 18, 21 – 29 and 41 – 45 are now pending in the application.

### **DRAWINGS**

The Office Action Summary states that the drawings filed on November 5, 2003 are objected to by the Examiner. However, the Detailed Action states that the drawings received August 4, 2004 are approved by the Examiner. Applicants assume that the statement in the Detailed Action is correct and that the objection to the drawings in the Office Action Summary was in error. If not, applicants request that they be advised of the specific objections to the drawings and be given an opportunity to respond.

### **ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER**

The Detailed Action states claims 2 – 8, 11, 12, 14 – 19, 21 – 24, 26 – 27 and 29 are objected to as depending from a rejected base claim and would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. However, the Office Action summary identifies a smaller group of claims as being objected to, that is, claims 2, 7, 16, 21 and 26. Applicants assume that the Detailed Action is correct and are responding accordingly as discussed below. If this is not the case, applicants request that they be so advised and be given an opportunity to respond.

Applicant(s) have amended claims 2, 3, 11, 21, 22 and 29 to incorporate the limitations of their respective base claims and any intervening claims. Therefore, claims 2, 3, 11, 21, 22 and 29 should now be in condition for allowance.

With regard to claim 14, it was already in independent form and applicants submit that it should be in condition for allowance.

Applicants have amended claims 8 and 9 so that they now depend from amended claim 3, amended claims 10 and 13 so that they now depend from amended claim 2, and amended claim 25 so that it now depends from amended claim 22. Applicants submit that amended claims 8, 9, 10, 13 and 25 are therefore allowable for at least these reasons.

Claims 4 – 7 depend directly or indirectly from amended claim 3 and are therefore allowable for at least that reason. Claim 12 depends from amended claim 11 and is therefore allowable for at least that reason. Claims 15 – 18 depend, directly or indirectly from claim 14 and are therefore allowable for at least that reason. Claims 23, 24 and 26 – 28 depend directly or indirectly from amended claim 22 and are allowable for at least that reason.

New claims 41 – 43, which contain limitations comparable to those in original claims 8 – 10, respectively, depend from amended claim 2 and are allowable for at least that reason. New claims 44 and 45, which contain limitations comparable to those in original claims 27 and 28, respectively, depend from amended claim 21 and are allowable for at least that reason.


To further prosecution of the allowed/allowable claims, applicants have also canceled rejected claims 1 and 20, objected to claim 19, and the previously withdrawn claims 30 – 40 without prejudice to prosecuting the subject matter of them in a subsequent application, such as a continuation or divisional application.

## CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: Dec. 1, 2004

By:   
Roland A. Fuller III  
Reg. No. 31,160

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.  
P.O. Box 828  
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303  
(248) 641-1600